UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

FIFTH COMMITTEE
59th meeting
held on
Thursday, 31 March 1994
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 59th MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. HADID	(Algeria)
later:	Mrs. EMERSON (Vice-Chairman)	(Portugal)
later:	Mr. HADID	(Algeria)

Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. MSELLE

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 165: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS MISSION IN HAITI (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 132: FINANCING OF THE ACTIVITIES ARISING FROM SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 687 (1991) (continued)

(a) UNITED NATIONS IRAQ-KUWAIT OBSERVATION MISSION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 160: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCE IN CYPRUS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 159: FINANCING OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL FOR THE PROSECUTION OF PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR SERIOUS VIOLATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW COMMITTED IN THE TERRITORY OF THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA SINCE 1991 (continued)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/48/SR.59
27 April 1994
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

94-80612 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 165: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS MISSION IN HAITI (continued) (A/48/803)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, with regard to the financing of the United Nations Mission in Haiti (UNMIH), the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions recommended that, at the current stage, the sum already approved by the General Assembly by its decision 48/477 of 23 December 1993 should be appropriated, namely, US$ 1,383,000 gross ($1,364,000 net) for the period from 23 September 1993 to 22 March 1994. He added that, subsequent to the report in document A/48/803, the Secretary-General had recommended that the Security Council should extend the mandate of UNMIH for a period of three months (S/1994/311). By its resolution 905 (1994) of 23 March 1994, the Security Council had decided to extend the mandate of UNMIH until 30 June 1994. In a letter dated 28 March 1994 addressed to the Advisory Committee, the Controller had indicated that the estimated cost of maintaining the Mission in its present form from 23 March to 30 June 1994 was $143,700 gross ($138,100 net) and that the requirements for the period after June 1994 were estimated at $44,200 gross ($42,500 net) a month. It should be pointed out that the non-recurrent expenditures incurred under the previous mandate in connection with the survey and technical mission to Haiti and the advance team of 30 persons were not included in the estimated costs of the maintenance of the Mission after 23 March 1994. As the General Assembly was still in session, the Advisory Committee recommended that the Secretary-General should be authorized to enter into commitments in the amount of $143,700 for the period from 23 March to 30 June 1994 and in the amount of $44,200 gross a month for the period after 30 June should the Security Council decide to extend the Mission's mandate.

2. Mr. STITT (United Kingdom) said that, as the Committee would probably have before it a draft decision on the proposals of the Advisory Committee, his delegation would like a representative of the Secretary-General to indicate whether there were sufficient resources in the special account to accommodate those proposals or whether it would be necessary to apportion the expenses for the period after 22 March 1994.

3. Mr. HOSANG (Director, Peace-keeping Financing Division) said that of the amount of approximately $1.3 million apportioned among Member States for the financing of UNMIH, as at 29 March 1994, $486,000 had been received, leaving a balance of $833,000. Since an additional amount of $143,000 was required, authorization would have to be sought to enter into commitments on the understanding that Member States would pay the outstanding balance of $833,000.

AGENDA ITEM 132: FINANCING OF THE ACTIVITIES ARISING FROM SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 687 (1991) (continued)

(a) UNITED NATIONS IRAQ-KUWAIT OBSERVATION MISSION (continued) (A/C.5/48/L.49)

4. Mr. KABIR (Rapporteur) introduced draft resolution A/C.5/48/L.49 on the financing of the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM).

5. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.5/48/L.49 without a vote.

6. Draft resolution A/C.5/48/L.49 was adopted without a vote.

7. Mr. SPAANS (Netherlands) welcomed the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.5/48/L.49 and said that his country's authorities were prepared to consider the rationalization of the budgetary procedures of the General Assembly, an issue which the Secretary-General had raised repeatedly in his reports on the financing of peace-keeping operations. His delegation particularly welcomed the fact that paragraph 18 of the draft resolution used the phrase "on an experimental basis" which could be used again in the future in other similar resolutions. That paragraph provided for a longer period of authorization for the Secretary-General to enter into commitments and a smaller role for the General Assembly in the budgetary process. However, if such improvements were to be possible, the work of the Organization with respect to budgetary matters would have to be improved, as would the participation of Member States, and his delegation was prepared to cooperate with other delegations and with the Secretariat to achieve that objective.

8. Mr. DAMICO (Brazil) said that paragraph 18 of the draft resolution was an experimental provision based on an idea that had been raised for the first time in a key report of the Advisory Committee (A/48/990) and had been endorsed by the General Assembly in resolution 47/218 B, namely, that it might be useful to guarantee resources for a longer period for the financing of peace-keeping operations which had a stable pattern. In applying that provision, the Secretariat would have to take the whole of paragraph 42 of the aforementioned report into account so that no apportionment of expenses should be decided until the Security Council had extended the mandate of UNIKOM.

9. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had concluded that stage of its consideration of agenda item 132 (a) and he requested the Rapporteur to report thereon direct to the plenary General Assembly.

AGENDA ITEM 160: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCE IN CYPRUS (continued) (A/C.5/48/L.51)

10. Mrs. EMERSON (Portugal) introduced draft resolution A/C.5/48/L.51 on the financing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) and urged the Committee to adopt it without a vote.

11. Draft resolution A/C.5/48/L.51 was adopted without a vote.

12. Mr. GUREN (Turkey) said that his country had reluctantly joined in the consensus in favour of the draft resolution in order to express its support for the activities of UNFICYP. However, as far as paragraph 16, in particular, was concerned, he wished to state that Turkey's participation in the adoption of the draft resolution should not be construed as recognition by Turkey of the "Government of Cyprus" as the legal Government of the island.

13. Mr. BUIN (France), supported by Mr. ZEVELAKIS (Greece), welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution and the achievement of a rapid consensus. However, he regretted that the funding mechanism used for UNIKOM had not been applied to UNFICYP, which, in his opinion, was a stable operation; that would have allowed the commitment authority to be extended for only a few months so that the budget could have been considered by the Fifth Committee during the regular session of the General Assembly. He regretted that the budget would have to be considered again in December and feared that that might lead to a recurrence of what had happened in December 1992. He hoped that in the following months, the streamlining process would continue and, in that connection, he supported the statement by the Netherlands delegation.

14. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that, while his country was pleased to support the resolution, it regretted that it did not include the usual formula which reflected outstanding contributions in respect of peace-keeping operations. He assumed that the deletion of that paragraph, which his delegation had accepted, as well as the deletion of his country's amendment concerning a list of "good and bad payers", had been due to the fact that there were over 120 Member States in arrears, a fact which discredited the generally held notion that the financial crisis of the United Nations was caused by one Member State alone.

15. Mr. JU Kuilin (China) said that, if authorization was granted to enter into commitments for a prolonged period, very serious problems might arise with respect, for example, to the annual nature of the budget and the volume of reserves for peace-keeping operations. It was an issue which affected the interests of many States. The problem of an annual budget had to be considered in the framework of other agenda items and it must be based on various requirements, the most fundamental of which was an efficient and comprehensive system of management. In the current circumstances, his delegation could not accept an annual budget for peace-keeping operations. Unfortunately, the consultations had been very complicated and it had been very difficult to secure the adoption of the resolution. Much more time had been required than had initially been expected for various reasons, including the complicated nature of the issue and the new ideas proposed by certain Member States during the consultations which other delegations had not had time to consider. He expressed the hope that, in future, the Fifth Committee would use the sound working method which was already established. Member States and the Secretariat must show greater understanding and, despite the limitations created by differences of principle, seek to achieve compromise solutions. In his view, that was the way to reduce the volume of work of the Fifth Committee.

16. Mr. STAVRINOS (Cyprus) thanked the members of the Committee for their sensitivity and the sense of justice they had demonstrated by adopting the draft resolution. The statement by the representative of Turkey was indicative of the respect shown by his country for the standards and decisions of the United Nations and for the standards and principles of international law. He merely wished to say that the Government of the Republic of Cyprus was grateful to the United Nations and to all its Member States, with one exception.

17. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 160 and he requested the Rapporteur to report thereon direct to the General Assembly.

AGENDA ITEM 159: FINANCING OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL FOR THE PROSECUTION OF PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR SERIOUS VIOLATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW COMMITTED IN THE TERRITORY OF THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA SINCE 1991 (continued) (A/C.5/48/36, A/C.5/48/44/Add.1, A/C.5/48/68 and A/48/915)

18. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), referring to a question raised by the representative of Uganda during informal consultations with regard to paragraph 21 of document A/48/915 as to why the Advisory Committee recommended that the authorization to enter into further commitments not exceeding $11 million should cover the period only until 31 December 1994, explained that the report indicated specific areas about which more information on 1994 was required so that the Advisory Committee and the General Assembly could estimate more precisely the budgetary requirements of the Tribunal for 1995. In paragraph 12 of the report, therefore, the Secretary-General was requested to submit, by 1 November 1994, a further report on the International Tribunal. Paragraphs 12 and 13 indicated the type of information required.

19. Mr. STITT (United Kingdom) said that, since, during the informal consultations, the representatives of the Secretary-General had referred to problems concerning the authorization to enter into commitments that would extend beyond the end of 1994, such as the hiring of staff and the leasing of premises for the Tribunal, it was his understanding that the question asked by the representative of Uganda was whether the Advisory Committee, in making a recommendation that would cover only the period until the end of 1994, had taken into consideration the difficulties which that could pose for the Secretariat and its impact on the management of the Tribunal.

20. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, as the Controller had indicated in an informal meeting, if it proved necessary to engage staff for one year, for example, the Secretariat would have to be authorized to conclude the necessary contracts. Similarly, the Financial Regulations established procedures which would permit the Tribunal to enter into obligations beyond the period recommended by the Advisory Committee. Thus, the Secretary-General could conclude contracts and then approach the Advisory Committee and the General Assembly before the end of the year with a request for resources for 1995. For example, the 67 posts proposed for the Investigation and Prosecutorial Units of the Office of the

(Mr. Mselle)

Prosecutor would certainly not have to be filled immediately, but the Secretary-General could proceed to fill some of them to deal with the workload of the Tribunal until the end of 1994.

21. Mr. ZEVELAKIS (Greece), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the General Assembly should send a clear message concerning its determination to give effect to the resolution to create the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991. The Tribunal must be provided with sufficient resources so that it would be on a stable financial basis that would allow it to fulfil its mandate fully in an objective and independent manner. The European Union supported the Secretary-General's proposals for its financing, but was of the view that commitment authority alone was not sufficient to finance the activities of the Tribunal, and that assessments should also be levied on the Member States. That would allow the Tribunal to hire staff on a long-term basis and to sign a lease for its headquarters, for which negotiations had been concluded. Like the United States, the Nordic countries, Australia and Japan, as well as other countries, the European Union believed that the financing of the Tribunal should be dealt with in a section of the regular budget, without prejudice to the funding of other regular budget activities and programmes. If necessary, the European Union would be ready to accept an additional assessment.

22. With respect to the conditions of service of judges, the European Union endorsed the comments of the representative of Sweden, speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries. In connection with paragraph 17 of the report of the Advisory Committee (A/48/915), it believed that the appropriate arrangements referred to had already been agreed and that the General Assembly should take action on the matter. Finally, the European Union was especially pleased that the host country of the Tribunal was one of its member States. Several of its members had pledged voluntary contributions to the Tribunal.

23. Mr. VARELA (Chile) said he was convinced that the existence of the Tribunal, which would be a valuable tool in helping to restore peace, would contribute to the prevention of further serious violations of international humanitarian law and would allow those responsible for the atrocities which were still being committed in the region to be punished.

24. Chile was prepared to give the Secretary-General authorization to enter into further commitments not exceeding $11 million while awaiting the revised estimates referred to in his report. That would allow the time needed for further study without preventing the Tribunal from beginning its operations as soon as possible.

25. Furthermore, Chile believed that the activities of the Tribunal, which resulted from, and were closely linked to, a peace-keeping operation, should be financed in accordance with the special scale used for such operations, which was a system of financing that sought equity and financial justice.

26. Ms. PENA (Mexico) said that Mexico welcomed the offer of the Netherlands to finance the first few months of the lease of the headquarters of the Tribunal. With regard to the statement by the Secretariat that, as the Tribunal acquired greater experience, it would be necessary to re-evaluate the budget estimates, her delegation believed that the estimates should be reviewed annually in order to ensure appropriate and adequate financing for the Tribunal.

27. She hoped that the Secretariat would be in a position to respond to the questions raised in paragraphs 9, 12 and 13 of the report of the Advisory Committee (A/48/915); her delegation supported general administrative management on an annual basis. On the other hand, it was concerned that the judges of the Tribunal would be remunerated in direct relation to the services required of them; it shared the Advisory Committee's view on that matter as stated in paragraphs 12 and 21 of its report.

28. Mexico had stated its position on the modalities for the financing of the Tribunal at the Committee's 70th, 72nd and 76th meetings (A/C.5/47/SR.70, 72 and 76). Although the establishment of the Tribunal would generate costs that should be shared by all the Member States, she emphasized the special responsibility of the permanent members of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security, the context in which the Council had decided to establish the Tribunal. As the Government of Mexico had noted in document S/25417, the format adopted for the establishment of the Tribunal had bypassed other principal organs of the United Nations, in particular the General Assembly, with regard to the authorization and monitoring of the mechanisms for the maintenance of international peace and security.

29. Her delegation believed that special funding, with resources apportioned in accordance with the scale utilized for activities undertaken under Chapter VII of the Charter, would ensure the necessary financing for the Tribunal and avoid the danger that the resources might be used to meet other objectives established in the Charter. Since the Tribunal was not a permanent mechanism but a special institution, it should be financed as such. Furthermore, if, as some delegations believed, the adoption of a method of financing similar to that for activities undertaken under Chapter VII of the Charter could affect the objectivity and independence of the judges of the Tribunal, the origin and appropriateness of the voluntary contributions made to it should be reviewed.

30. Her delegation expressed its appreciation for the voluntary contributions made by the Governments of Pakistan, Hungary, Spain and Namibia to the trust fund which had been established to allow the Tribunal to begin its work.

31. Mr. DIMOV (Bulgaria) supported the Advisory Committee's proposal contained in paragraph 12 of its report (A/48/915), given that not all conditions for the working of the Tribunal had been made clear and because of the time constraints. His delegation was convinced of the need to provide a stable financial base which would permit the effective utilization of resources and ensure the objectivity and independence of the Tribunal. Effective utilization of resources was of utmost importance to Bulgaria in view of the heavy losses which it had sustained as a result of the sanctions imposed by the Security Council against Serbia and Montenegro.

(Mr. Dimov, Bulgaria)

32. His delegation noted with satisfaction the prevailing positive attitude to voluntary contributions as an important supplement to the core financing of the Tribunal. Finally, it shared the view of the European Union that the General Assembly should send a clear message of its determination to give effect to the resolution to create the International Tribunal, by providing it with all the necessary means to fulfil its mandate.

33. Mrs. Emerson (Portugal) took the Chair.

34. Ms. GOICOCHEA (Cuba) said that she was in general agreement with the views expressed by the representatives of Chile and Mexico. She fully agreed with other delegations on the need to give the Tribunal a sound and stable financial base, and supported the endorsement by General Assembly resolution 47/235 of the principle that the expenses of the Tribunal should be financed from assessed contributions. She therefore disagreed with the view that the Tribunal should be made to rely on voluntary contributions for its functioning. In her view, it should be financed by means of the special scale for several reasons. The Tribunal had been established for the sole purpose of prosecuting persons who were allegedly responsible for serious violations of international humanitarian law committed in the territory of the former Yugoslavia. It was common knowledge that the four Geneva Conventions and the Additional Protocols thereto contemplated situations of war. For that reason, the Security Council, given its special responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, could decide to establish such a mechanism. The link between the establishment of the Tribunal and peace and security was recognized in the ninth preambular paragraph of Security Council resolution 808 (1993).

35. It was regrettable that, in adopting the Statute of the Tribunal, the Security Council had encroached upon an area that was strictly within the competence of the General Assembly, having regard to its decision in article 32 of the Statute that the expenditure of the Tribunal should be met from the regular budget. The General Assembly should examine conflicts of competence between itself and the Security Council. It should also be mentioned, without thereby trying to excuse the Security Council for having adopted decisions which were within the competence of the General Assembly, that the Secretariat bore an essential part of the responsibility, since it had not properly advised the Council on the matter.

36. In paragraph 22 of his report (A/C.5/48/44/Add.1), the Secretary-General requested the General Assembly to determine the conditions of service of the members of the Tribunal. However, since the Security Council had already encroached into that area and the judges had been elected on the understanding that their conditions of services would be the same as those of the judges of the International Court of Justice, there was little that the General Assembly could do in that regard. Consequently, her delegation supported the conclusions and recommendations expressed by the Advisory Committee in paragraphs 8 and 9 of its report (A/48/915).

(Ms. Goicochea, Cuba)

37. The representatives of the Secretary-General had referred to the difficulties which they faced in recruiting personnel because of the duration of the contracts. In that regard, neither document A/C.5/48/44 nor A/C.5/48/44/Add.1 offered detailed justification for the number of posts by categories and other elements, in accordance with the request made by the General Assembly in endorsing the conclusions and recommendations contained in document A/47/980. Cuba would like the Secretariat to indicate the reasons why it had resubmitted requests for posts without proper justification, a recurring practice which, far from facilitating consensus, rendered the negotiations between Member States more difficult. In that regard, Cuba considered it necessary to include in the draft resolution the relevant recommendations contained in paragraphs 12, 13 and 14 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/48/915).

38. While Cuba welcomed the information given informally by the representative of the Netherlands concerning the negotiations over the seat of the Tribunal, in the light of paragraph 18 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/48/915) it was important for the Secretariat to confirm that information officially in order to adopt the relevant decisions requested in the revised estimates submitted by the Secretary-General in paragraph 22 of his report (A/C.5/48/44/Add.1). Furthermore, Cuba wished to request the Secretariat to confirm that the $11 million which had been proposed would permit the Tribunal to discharge its planned functions.

39. Ms. ROTHEISER (Austria) said that her delegation attached the utmost importance to the functioning of, and thus to a sound funding basis for, the Tribunal. Austria was considering making voluntary contributions to the Tribunal as a sign of its commitment to that activity.

40. Austria was satisfied with the information given by the Secretariat in informal consultations that the US$ 11 million recommended by the Advisory Committee until the end of the current year should be sufficient, but believed that an appropriation and assessment would be necessary in order to secure the financial means of the Tribunal. In her view, a mere granting of commitment authority might put the financing of that activity in jeopardy.

41. In order to be able to assess, it was first necessary to decide on the mode of financing, and as a matter of principle, Austria was of the view that, due to the nature of its activities, the Tribunal should be financed from the regular budget. The costs of the Tribunal would represent an additional levy on Member States, taking into account the negative rate of real growth of the regular budget. Her delegation stood ready to take the divergent views of other delegations into account.

42. Mr. MANCINI (Italy) said that his Government's position had been clearly expressed by the delegation of Greece, which had spoken on behalf of the twelve member States of the European Union. Since it was essential for the International Tribunal to have a solid financial base, Italy had decided to make a voluntary contribution to the Tribunal's budget in the amount of three thousand million lire, or approximately $1.9 million.

43. Mr. KELLY (Ireland) supported the statement made by Greece on behalf of the European Union and said that, in view of the great importance of the International Tribunal and the need for it to have a sound financial base, the Government of Ireland had decided to make a voluntary contribution to the Tribunal's Trust Fund in the amount of 15,000 Irish pounds, or approximately $21,000, which would be made available during the summer.

44. Mr. MILLER (Canada) said that the Tribunal should be financed from the United Nations regular budget for the biennium 1994-1995 and that funds should be granted for the remaining months of the biennium not just for 1994. The Tribunal should have a sound and stable financial base; that was essential to its independence and impartiality. Canada shared the concern of Austria and other States that the delay in financing, or insufficient funding, might send the wrong political signals regarding the international community's commitment to the Tribunal.

45. Mr. Hadid (Algeria) resumed the Chair.

46. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said it was to be assumed that all Member States had an interest in ensuring that the Tribunal began operating as soon as possible and that it had a sound and secure financial base. Although the Secretariat had indicated that it could work with the amount of $11 million recommended by the Advisory Committee, Ghana would have preferred for the General Assembly to appropriate resources and subsequently to fix assessments; however, paragraph 12 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/48/915) made it clear that such a procedure would not have been proper.

47. His country welcomed the explanation provided in that paragraph of the factors that had caused difficulties for the Secretary-General. In view of the political importance of the issue, Ghana also strongly supported the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the Secretary-General should be authorized to enter into commitments not exceeding $11 million, and hoped that the Secretary-General would be able to submit the report requested.

48. While taking note of the Security Council's wishes regarding the seat of the Tribunal, Ghana recalled the General Assembly's decision to reserve the right to take a final decision on the matter. There was every indication that the only viable offer was that of the Netherlands, and his delegation was prepared to support a decision by the General Assembly on the question. His Government urged the Secretary-General to make every effort to conclude the negotiations as soon as possible, and urged the Government of the Netherlands to provide the facilities required at the lowest cost and in the manner most expedient for the Organization.

49. The question of the assessment and apportionment of contributions must be analysed carefully, and the General Assembly should not bow to pressures external to the Organization. It had been stated that in view of the nature of the activities to be undertaken by the Tribunal, the General Assembly should decide to apply the scale of contributions, to be charged to the regular budget. If the activities were of a legal nature, then the decision should have been taken by the International Court of Justice, which was the competent body. It

(Mr. Dankwa, Ghana)

had also been stated that the Tribunal would deal with human rights questions, and that, accordingly, it was doubtful whether the Security Council was competent to establish it. Ghana believed that any decision taken by the Security Council should relate to the maintenance of international peace and security. The establishment of the Tribunal was a signal from the Security Council that a precedent should be established for the future that would promote international peace and security. Hence, while it might be logical for the costs of the Tribunal to be assessed on the basis of the special scale, other criteria should also be taken into account.

50. Accordingly, in view of the time limitations and in the light of the indication by the Secretariat that it could work with the amount of $11 million, it would be advisable, for the time being, for the General Assembly to accept the Advisory Committee's recommendation and to continue to seek a more acceptable mode of financing. In any case, it was encouraging to note the willingness of some Member States to make voluntary contributions, since even if they could not replace assessed contributions they were a sign that the Secretariat would not lack for funds. It was better to proceed with caution and prudence so that the final decision would have the support of all countries and the credibility of the Organization would be maintained.

51. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) requested the Secretariat to provide a detailed list of countries which had paid their voluntary contributions and those which had made pledges, together with the sums paid or pledged by each one. He also requested the Secretariat to indicate whether, in accordance with paragraph 47 of the report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/48/44), which dealt with the travel of the accused persons, the United Nations air transport rules would be applied in respect of flights of over nine hours.

52. Mr. BOIN (France) supported the comments made by the United States and requested to be provided with the most recently updated statement of the status of pledges in goods and services, particularly staffing services, that were specially intended for the Prosecutor's Office. It would also be useful to know the number of staff required, for example, by the Prosecutor's Office, as well as the proportion to be financed by voluntary contributions in goods or services. France's main interest was in preserving the independence and impartiality of the Tribunal, since the activities to be undertaken by it were solely of a jurisdictional nature.

53. Ms. GOICOCHEA (Cuba) reminded the Secretariat that she wished to know the official status of the negotiations concerning the seat of the Tribunal and whether the amount of $11 million was appropriate for carrying out the activities envisaged for the current year. In view of the time limitations, she would not go into details about the issues relating to the lack of justification for the posts requested.

/...

54. Mr. TAKASU (Controller), replying to the questions raised by delegations, said that the negotiations were in a final phase, and that all that was needed was the General Assembly's authorization for the signing of the agreements. With regard to the resources recommended for the Tribunal by the Advisory Committee, namely, $11 million for 1994, efforts would be made to keep to that sum and, if other needs arose, guidance would be sought from the General Assembly. With regard to the justification of posts, some areas remained to be defined, as indicated in document A/C.5/48/44 and addendum 1 thereto, which should be considered an integral part of the original document. Paragraph 20 of document A/C.5/48/44/Add.1 and paragraphs 32 and 39 of document A/C.5/48/44 indicated the additional staffing requirements of the Tribunal. Nevertheless, he took note of the Cuban delegation's request; the next report would seek to provide fuller information in the light of the experience gained.

55. Voluntary contributions had so far been received from Hungary, Liechtenstein, Namibia, Spain and Pakistan, and pledges had been made by Canada, Ireland, Italy, Norway, the United States and other countries. The starting-point for the calculation of the travel costs of accused persons had been the assumption that such travel would be basically to and from countries adjacent to and within the region and that, accordingly, the 9-hour rule could be used.

56. Mr. SPAANS (Netherlands) associated himself with the views expressed by the delegation of Greece, took note with interest of the clarifications provided by the Controller in reply to the Cuban delegation's question, and expressed satisfaction at the fact that the negotiations were all but finalized and that all that was needed was for the General Assembly to take decisions regarding the signing of agreements.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.